

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**2 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

3 RONALD J. ALLISON,

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00302-APG-VCF

4 Plaintiff

**Order**

5 v.

6 CLARK COUNTY DETENTION CENTER,

7 Defendant

9 Plaintiff Ronald J. Allison brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to  
10 redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while incarcerated at the Clark County  
11 Detention Center. ECF No. 1-1. On March 22, 2022, Magistrate Judge Ferenbach ordered  
12 Allison to file a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee  
13 by May 23, 2022. ECF No. 3. Judge Ferenbach warned Allison that the action could be  
14 dismissed if he failed to do so by that deadline. *Id.* at 3. That deadline expired and Allison did  
15 not comply with the order or otherwise respond.

16 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of  
17 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.  
18 *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may  
19 dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See*  
20 *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply  
21 with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S.*  
22 *Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court  
23 order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, I must consider:

1 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the need to manage my docket;  
 2 (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on  
 3 their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine*  
 4 *Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833  
 5 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)).

6 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and my  
 7 interest in managing my docket, weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice  
 8 to the defendants, also favors of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the  
 9 occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an  
 10 action. *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor, the  
 11 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits, is greatly outweighed by the factors  
 12 favoring dismissal.

13 The fifth factor requires me to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used to  
 14 correct the party's failure that brought about the need to consider dismissal. *See Yourish v. Cal.*  
 15 *Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives  
 16 *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); *accord Pagtalunan v.*  
 17 *Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002). Courts "need not exhaust every sanction short  
 18 of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must explore possible and meaningful  
 19 alternatives." *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action  
 20 cannot realistically proceed unless Allison either files a complete application to proceed *in forma*  
 21 *pauperis* or pays the filing fee, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another  
 22 deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays the inevitable  
 23 and squanders the court's resources. The circumstances here do not indicate that this case will

1 be an exception: there is no hint that Allison needs additional time or evidence that he did not  
2 receive the order. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these  
3 circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

4 I therefore order that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on Allison's failure  
5 to file a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the filing fee in compliance  
6 with Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's order. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment  
7 accordingly and close this case. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If  
8 Allison wishes to pursue his claims, he must file a complaint in a new case.

9 Dated: June 1, 2022

10   
11 U.S. District Judge

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23